

**REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**

Applicant has elected the invention of Species I drawn to Figures 1-14, and submits that Claims 1-59 and 82-86 each read on Species I.

Additionally, however, Applicant respectfully traverses the Election / Restriction requirement for the following reasons.

Claims to be restricted to different species must be mutually exclusive. The general test as to when claims are restricted, respectively, to different species is the fact that one claim recites limitations which under the disclosure are found in a first species but not in a second, while a second claim recites limitations disclosed only for the second species and not the first. MPEP §806.04(f).

The Examiner alleges that Species I drawn to Figures 1-14, Species II drawn to Figures 15-22, and Species III drawn to Figures 23-26, are each directed to a patentably distinct species, and that Claims 1, 60 and 78 are currently generic.

In respectful disagreement with the Examiner, Applicant submits that Species I and II are not mutually exclusive, and that Species I and III are not mutually exclusive.

Regarding the absence of mutual exclusivity between Species I and II, Applicant submits that Claims 8 and 83 of Species I each recite elements found in both Species I and Species II, and therefore each read on both Species I and II.

Regarding the absence of mutual exclusivity between Species I and III, Applicant submits that Claims 10 and 84 of Species I each recite elements found in both Species I and Species III, and therefore each read on both Species I and III.

In view of Claims 1, 60 and 78 being considered generic, Claims 8 and 83 each reading on both Species I and II, and Claims 10 and 84 each reading on both Species I and III, Applicant submits that Species I, II and III lack mutual exclusivity. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that a restriction of the invention as to Species I, II and III for examination purposes is improper.

For at least this reason, this Restriction Requirement is wholeheartedly traversed, and removal of the Requirement, at least with respect to the improper groupings noted above, is respectfully requested.

Consideration and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested. The foregoing is believed to be fully responsive to this office action.

If there are any charges with respect to this amendment, or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by applicant's attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

Applicant's Attorneys

By: 

David Arnold

Registration No: 48,894

Customer No. 23413

Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929  
Fax: (860) 286-0115